

PATENT APPLICATION

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 2143**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Taro TERA0

Group Art Unit: 2143

Application No.: 10/658,810

Examiner: M. FEARER

Filed: September 10, 2003

Docket No.: 117127

For: INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEM FOR HOLDING AND PROVIDING
INFORMATION AS PROCESSING OBJECTS THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH
CHARACTERISTIC VALUES (AS AMENDED)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the October 18, 2007 Office Action, please consider the following remarks.

Claims 3-14 are pending.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative, Mr. Paul Tsou, during the January 8 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the remarks below.

The Office Action rejects claims 3 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Seki et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0005047) in view of Gordon (U.S. Publication No. 2003/00097320) and further in view of Bradley (U.S. Patent No. 6,871,245); claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Seki in view of Gordon and further in view of Cheng et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0105974) and still further in view of Bradley; claim 5 under

35 U.S.C. §103 over Seki in view of Cheng and further in view of Bradley; claims 6 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Seki in view of Bradley and claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Seki in view of Bradley and further in view of Call (U.S. Patent No. 7,117,227). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action admits that Seki and Gordon do not disclose a providing unit for accepting a received characteristic value as an information request for a piece of data as a processing object from a requestor, but asserts that Bradley discloses the missing subject matter. We disagree.

As agreed during the interview, Bradley is directed to file system translators. Bradley discloses that operating systems and file systems are particularly designed to operate with each other. However, when an operating system is provided direct access to a file system that is designed for a different operating system, the commands from the operating system must be translated because file systems are many times incompatible with other operating systems. See C2/L17-34.

For example, Bradley discloses that many times file systems allow the same file name for different files because of different paths that must be traversed to access these two different files with the same file name. Thus, depending on the scheme that a particular filing system utilizes to store these files, a command to access a particular file name cannot be directly used. For this reason, translators or converters are used to interface various different operating systems with other file systems to provide direct access to files of the file system by a foreign operating system..

In contrast, Seki does not disclose direct file access by file systems. Instead, Seki discloses that the client side proxy 40 uses HTTP protocol to request a service side proxy 30 for a file using a fingerprint of that data. See paragraph [0082]. Thus, the scheme provided in Bradley is not applicable to the client/server system disclosed in Seki because Seki does

not contemplate an operating system's direct access to a foreign file system. Rather, communication is accomplished through a common protocol (HTTP protocol). Thus, the problems solved by Bradley are unrelated to the circumstances discussed in Seki.

Further, as also agreed during the personal interview, Bradley does not disclose or suggest anything regarding using a fingerprint in a file request and accessing a file using a fingerprint. Rather, Bradley merely contemplates accessing a file using a normal command of an operating system but translating such a command into the command of a different file system so that direct access may be accomplished. Thus, not only would one of ordinary skill in the art not combine Bradley with Seki because, Bradley is not applicable in the circumstances of Seki, even if combined (though improperly) the combination of Seki and Bradley would not have disclosed or suggested accepting a received characteristic value as an information request for a piece of data as a processing object for a requestor and ... to provide the piece of data to the request, as recited in claims 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10. Thus, Bradley does supply the subject matter lacking in Seki.

The Office Action cites Call as a new reference against claims 11-14. The Office Action asserts that Call discloses a procedure for holding information for specifying characteristic value calculation method that was admitted to be lacking in Seki and Bradley. However, Call does not disclose or suggest accepting a received characteristic value as an information request for a piece of data and providing the piece of data to the requestor, as recited in claims 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10. Thus, Call does not supply the subject matter lacking in Seki. As discussed in our July 19 Amendment, Gordon and Cheng do not supply the subject matter lacking in Seki. Thus, Bradley, Gordon, Cheng and Call do not supply the subject matter lacking in Seki.

Claims 4, 7 and 8 depend from claim 3; claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 9; and claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 10. Thus, Seki, Gordon, Bradley, Cheng, and Call individually or in combination do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 3-14. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 3-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Paul Tsou
Registration No. 37,956

JAO:PT/eks

Date: January 16, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--